

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/016,839	DARCANGELO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Carlos Lopez	1731	

All Participants:
Status of Application: Pending

 (1) Carlos Lopez.

(3) _____.

 (2) Adenike Adewuya .

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 4 May 2004
Time: 4:55pm
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

6

Prior art documents discussed:

Deeren et al and Neidorf


Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: It was noted to applicant that claim 6 read on Deeren et al reference. Applicant proposed amending claim 6 to recite that the claimed assembly was not in bundle form but in a layered horizontal form as shown in figure 6A. However, it was noted that applicant's proposal would invoke a 103(a) rejection under Deeren in view of Niedorf. Applicant then agreed to revert to the original language of claim 6 and change its dependency to the indicated allowed claim 13.